

Remarks

The non-final Office Action dated September 19, 2008 indicated that claims 1-13 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) over Soloff (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,384) in view of Agnihotri (US Patent Pub. 2003/0065503). Applicant traverses all of the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

The cited references are wholly unrelated to the claimed invention, and the proposed combination fails to provide correspondence to limitations including those directed to selecting and displaying a particular type of content for displaying with each of different video services, based upon a user input specifying the type of content. For example, various embodiments of the present invention are applicable to displaying a particular type of information for different video services, such as by displaying match score data for different football matches provided on different video streams. A user need only select his or her display preferences for a particular type of program, and content corresponding to the selected preferences is automatically displayed for similar programs (*e.g.*, the score of a particular football match is displayed, and when the user switches to a different football match, the score of the different football match is displayed).

The proposed combination of the '384 reference with the '5503 publication generally fails to comprehend the claimed invention (as exemplified above), and specifically fails to provide teaching or suggestion of various limitations in each of the independent claims. For example, the cited portions of the '384 reference do not disclose processing and displaying different video services having different types of data elements for selective display, and further do not disclose the selection of any type of information (*e.g.*, data elements) to be displayed along with video for the respective services. The Office Action appears to have confused the cited selection of video camera angles with the claimed selection of a type of data to be displayed along with video images. The cited video camera angles in the '384 reference are for a "single event" such as an automobile race, for which any such secondary data elements are static and for which the displayed information is not based upon any user selection. As described at column 4:62-65, "the event information presented to the user is considered non-changing, or static. Static information is defined as data that will not change during the course of the event." This is consistent with the

background of the instant application, which differentiates viewing angles for a single event from completely different video streams. Accordingly, the '384 reference's approach to displaying different camera angles does not correspond to the claimed approach to selecting and displaying different types of information for a particular video service.

As indicated in the Office Action, the '384 reference also does not disclose calculating an output image to be displayed in response to selected data-elements, with "the first data element and the second data element being semantically related." That is, the '384 reference fails to teach or suggest the selection and display of similar content for different video services. The Office Action then cites to the secondary '5503 publication as teaching "the use of a thesaurus for analyzing text data to be replaced." However, this cited thesaurus use does not have anything to do with claim limitations directed to calculating "an output image to be displayed on the display device in response to the data-element selected by the filter," as may be implemented for selectively displaying a related type of data pertaining to different video streams. Applicant cannot ascertain any relationship between the claim limitations and the cited thesaurus-based analysis of text data, and the Office Action has not provided any explanation of such a relationship. Correspondingly, the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest claim limitations directed to displaying a similar type of data for different events, where the data is specific to the event being displayed.

Applicant further submits that there is no motivation to modify the '384 reference to include any selection of data to be displayed when switching camera angles because the video services data is for the same event, and because the '384 reference simply does not provide different types of information that can be selected for display. As consistent with the above discussion, there is no need to choose semantically-related data since the cited "race data" is "static." This is consistent with the cited portions of the '384 reference at columns 4:62-65 and 5:30-40, which describe the display of different video angles for a "single event," where the displayed data is static the video angle itself is the only selection that is made. Furthermore, it would appear that displaying consistent data among different camera views as discussed in the '384 reference would render it inoperable for its intended purpose, which includes displaying static information pertaining to each camera view (*see, e.g.,* Figures 4 and 5 and related discussion at column 5). In this regard, there is no

motivation to modify the '384 reference to include the selection and display of data because no data is available for selection and the data remains static.

In view of the above, the Office Action has failed to show teaching or suggestion of all claim limitations, and has further failed to establish motivation for modifying the '384 reference. Applicant therefore requests that the rejections be removed.

Applicant further believes that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations in new claims 14-17 for reasons including those stated above, and further because the cited references do not disclose various limitations such as those directed to selecting one of a plurality of sets of ancillary data corresponding to a video event, based upon user inputs and data tags assigned to the ancillary data. Support for these limitations may be found throughout the specification and in the drawings, with exemplary embodiments described at paragraphs 0016 and 0017, and in connection with FIG. 1 at paragraphs 0044-0045 and as shown in Table 1.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections/objections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Aaron Waxler, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9068.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131
CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(NXPS.500PA)